go ahead with this, all these huge breakthroughs would occur. I want to reiterate, I am a doctor. I just saw patients a week ago. I have treated all these diseases. I have reviewed the medical literature. It is real pie in the sky to say there are going to be all these huge breakthroughs.

I have a letter from a member of the biotech industry, and I just want to read some of it. It says, ''I am a biotech scientist and founder of a genomic research company. As a scientist and cofounder and officer of the Biotechnology Association of Alabama that is an affiliate of the Biotechnology Industry Association, BIO, the group that is opposing my language,'' he says, ''there is no scientific imperative for proceeding with this manipulation of human life, and there are no valid or moral justifications for cloning human beings.''

Mr. Speaker, I can state that is indeed the case.

I further want to dismiss this notion that has been put forward by some of the speakers here in general debate that a cloned human embryo is somehow not alive or it is not human. There is just literally no basis in science to make that sort of a claim. I did my undergraduate degree in biochemistry. I studied cell biology, and I did basic research in molecular genetics.

I have a quote from another scientist that I would be happy to read. ''There is nothing synthetic about cells used in cloning.'' This is a researcher from Princeton. He says, ''An embryo formed from human cloning is very much a human embryo.''

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, the scientific research exception is meaningless. It allows for research, except that which is not specifically prohibited. If Members read section 301 of the bill, it prohibits somatic cell nuclear transfer, so any kind of representation that research is accepted is incorrect. It is tautological and it is bogus.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I would answer two things that were said, one by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) when the gentleman stated that this did not speak at all about cloning, it only spoke about stem cell research.

The point is that it may very well be true that once stem cell research is exploited and we know how to cure diseases or give people back the use of their arms and legs through stem cells, it may very well be true that that can only be done by the use of cloned stem cells in order to get around the rejection by the patient of stem cells from somebody else. It may be necessary to use the patient's own cloned stem cells.

The second point is in answer to what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) said. The point is, we do not know a lot of things. We do not know exactly what scientific research will show. We do not know exactly what adult stem cells can do, what embryonic stem cells can do, or cloned stem cells can do.

That is why it is a sentence of death to millions of Americans, to ban medical research which is what my colleagues are trying to do with this bill.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have one remaining speaker, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the base bill and in support of the substitute, the Greenwood-Deutsch substitute.

Generally speaking, there are three types of stem cell research. There is adult stem cell research which shows great promise, but with limitations in that adult stem cells cannot be differentiated into each and every type of cell.

There is embryonic stem cell work which shows even more promise because it does have the ability to be differentiated into a variety of stem cell lines for therapy and treatment.

But perhaps the most promising is embryonic stem cell research that employs the technique of somatic cell nuclear transfer. The primary benefit of this research and therapy is simple: It is not rejected by the patient. What that means for a child who is diabetic, you can use that child's own DNA, place it into a fertilized egg, develop Islet cells that will help that child produce insulin with the benefit it will not be rejected by the child.

What we are saying, if we allow stem cell research but we prohibit the research in this bill, we are saying we will allow stem cell research, but only if the patient will reject the therapy. What sense does that make when the substitute prohibits cloning for reproduction, prohibits the implantation of a fertilized egg with a donated set of DNA into a uterus for the purpose of giving birth to a child? That is prohibited under both bill and substitute.

But we need the research. We are losing scientists who are going overseas to conduct this research. The base bill even precludes us from benefiting from the research done in other countries. This cannot be allowed to go on.

Mr. Speaker, this is important to all of our futures. We must preserve this vital science research. I urge adoption of the substitute and rejection of the base bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Chamber agrees, and we have been here for about an hour and three-quarters, everyone in this Chamber agrees that we should ban human cloning, period. Everyone. There is consensus here.

Mr. Speaker, both pieces of legislation do that, but there is a divergence. The Weldon bill goes further to ban the somatic cell nuclear transfer. I would like to focus in response to what has been going on in the debate.

There is no longer a debate about stem cell research. This Congress collectively, both the House and the other body and the American people have made a decision. Whether the President has made his decision or not is irrelevant. The Congress and the American people have made our decision that we want to continue embryonic stem cell research. We collectively, as Americans, understand that issue, and it will continue regardless of what the President decides on this issue. My colleagues know that and understand that.

Let us talk about why there is a serious debate about it, though, and why I take it very seriously as well. When you have an egg and a sperm joining and the potentiality is to create a new unique human being, there are ethical issues involved regarding a transcendental event that could occur in the creation of a unique soul. That is what people find troubling and should find troubling, and should think about it and understand it.

Yet we understand the other issues and collectively we have made our decision that we are willing, that we want to continue with embryonic stem cell research because of the issues that we have talked about.

□ 1600

But let us talk about what somatic nuclear transfer is all about. It is not about that sperm and egg joining together. It is not about the potentiality to create a unique human being. It is not about a transcendental event that could occur. It is not about all those issues that some people correctly have struggled with and have come to conclusions and significant, serious moral-ethical issues.

What is going on here? What is going on here is an egg where the DNA is taken out, 23 chromosomes taken out from literally trillions of cells, trillions of cells, not billions, trillions of cells. Within the human body, one cell is taken out and 46 chromosomes are implanted. Not to create life, not to create an embryo, but to continue life, to save life for literally tens of millions of people, for potentially everyone in this Chamber and everyone in the country.

None of us know who is going to be stricken by one of these horrific diseases. No one knows who is going to get Alzheimer's or Parkinson's or cancer. It literally could be any of us in this Chamber or anyone watching on C-SPAN. It could be any of us. If we think about that, it could be any of us who have relatives, loved ones, who have these horrific diseases. Yet what this legislation would do would be to stop the research, to take one of those trillions of cells in the body, take out 46 chromosomes, put it in, so that you could survive, so that someone who is a